

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10
11 MOSTAFA ARAM AZADPOUR, No. C06-03272 MJJ

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.
14 **ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S**
MOTION FOR LEAVE

15 SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.,

16 Defendant.

17 **INTRODUCTION**

18 Before the Court is Plaintiff Mostafa Aram Azadpour's ("Plaintiff") Motion For Leave to
19 Move for Default Judgment.¹ Defendants Sun Microsystems, Inc., Matrix Absence Management,
20 Inc., Babu Turumella, and Norman Yeung ("Defendants") oppose Plaintiff's motion.² For the
21 following reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Leave.

22 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

23 On August 15, 2006, this Court ordered Plaintiff to seek leave before filing any further
24 motions in a related case. (C05-4087, Doc. #199.) The Order was in response to the voluminous
25 number of motions and notices of motions filed by Plaintiff, many of which lacked grounding in
26 applicable law and the adjudication of which resulted in the expenditure of considerable judicial
27 resources. On June 5, 2007, Plaintiff filed his instant motion, requesting leave to "1) Move for a

28
1Docket No. 223

2Docket No. 227

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1 Default Judgment and 2) Seek an Equitable Relief.”

ANALYSIS

3 First, Plaintiff asks the Court for leave to seek a default judgment. The Clerk of the Court
4 declined Plaintiff’s entry of default in light of Defendants’ pending motion to dismiss.³ As there is
5 no entry of default, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s request for leave to seek a default judgment.

6 Second, Plaintiff asks the court for equitable relief regarding tax information provided to the
7 California or Federal governments by Defendant Sun Microsystems. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s
8 request for equitable relief. Plaintiff’s demand for relief is duplicative of the relief he seeks in his
9 Second Amended Complaint. (Compl., ¶ 30) Because Plaintiff’s demands are already pending before
10 the Court, there is no need to address them in this motion.

CONCLUSION

12 For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Move for a
13 Default Judgment and Seek Equitable Relief.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: June 21, 2007



MARTIN J. JENKINS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

³Docket No. 231